

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: SEPTEMBER 8 - 11, 1992

OHIO STATE REPORT

NOVEMBER 30, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

**Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302**

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	5
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	5
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change	6
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	7
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	8
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	8
3.1 System Functionality	9
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	12
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	12
3.4 Current Automation Issues	12
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	12
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	12
4.2 Justification for the New System	12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	14
4.4 Conversion Approach	15
4.5 Project Management	15
4.6 FSP Participation	16
4.7 MIS Participation	16
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	16
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	18
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	18
6.1 System Profile	18
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	19
6.2.1 Operating Environment	19
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	20
6.2.3 Telecommunications	20
6.2.4 System Performance	21
6.2.5 System Response	21
6.2.6 System Downtime	21
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	21
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	21
7.1 CRIS-E Development Costs and Federal Funding	22
7.1.1 CRIS-E System Components	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components	22
7.1.2.1 Contractor Costs	23
7.2 Ohio Operational Costs	24
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	24
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	24
7.3 Ohio Cost Allocation Methodologies	24
7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology	24
7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics	25

APPENDICES

A	State of Ohio Exhibits	A-1
B	Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction	B-1
C	Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	4
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	5
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	7
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	8
7.1	Estimated CRIS-E Development Costs by Component	23
7.2	Food Stamp Program Operating Costs	24

APPENDIX A - State of Ohio Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Ohio Hardware Inventory	A-4

OHIO STATE REPORT
Site Visit September 8 - 11, 1992

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Client Registry Information System - Enhanced (CRIS-E)

Start Date: 1984

Completion Date: 1992

Contractor: Deloitte Touche

Transfer From: Not applicable

Cost:

Actual: \$69,715,000 (Through March 1992, includes some operational costs)

Projected: \$32,000,000 (First approved APD)

FSP Share: \$20,935,000 (Through March 1992)

FSP %: 30.0%

Number of Users: 10,535

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: IBM ES 9000/900, IBM ES 9000/720

Workstations: Memorex/Telex 3270 terminals

Telecommunications

Network: Statewide microwave network

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, General Assistance, Medicaid

The State of Ohio was one of the first two states visited to evaluate the data collection instruments. These visits were conducted in August and September of 1992 and resulted in modifications to the instruments. The changes were made to reduce the State burden associated with data collection and ensure that the data determined relevant for collection would be available at the State sites. When the scheduled State visits began in February 1993, the content of the individual State reports was changed dramatically to include additional information gathered during on-site interviews with representatives from program, systems, and financial management areas. This additional data was not captured during the visits to Ohio and South Carolina and the project contract provided for a single State visit to eliminate any undue burden on the State staff. Only the data captured during the initial on-site visit is incorporated in this report since the additional information normally included was not collected. There was also no information gathered regarding problems that may have been encountered during development or in system functionality.

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Ohio Department of Human Services (ODHS) is the designated State agency for the administration of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and other assistance programs in Ohio, which is a State-supervised, county-administered State. Within ODHS, there are nine principal offices:

- Administration and Planning
- Management Information Services
- Human Resource Management
- Fiscal Services
- County Operations
- Child Care and Family Services
- Child Support Enforcement
- Family Support and JOBS
- Medicaid

State level oversight of the Food Stamp and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Programs is provided by the Office of Family Support and JOBS, while Medicaid policy is the responsibility of the Office of Medicaid. The sections within the Office of Family Support and JOBS include: food stamp, public assistance program development, public assistance quality assurance, CRIS-E customer service, and training.

The CRIS-E system supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, and Medicaid Programs. System support is provided by the ODHS Office of Management Information Services (MIS) and a State level department that oversees the State data center and the Ohio Data Network (ODN). There are four bureaus and a deputy director's office within the MIS organization. The Bureau of Systems Development (BSD) has primary responsibility for application development and support and the Bureau of Technical Services (BTS) is responsible for system software support. The system resides on State-owned and operated equipment at the State data center. Telecommunications and operational support are provided by ODN and the State data center.

There are 88 counties in Ohio. The State population in 1990 was 10,887,325. Approximately 9.9 percent of the individuals in the State were food stamp recipients.

The level of unemployment in Ohio declined from 1982 to 1989 and increased in 1990 and 1991. Between 1982 and 1989, the State's unemployment rate decreased from 12.5 percent to 5.5 percent, which was a 56 percent decrease. The State's unemployment rate increased to 5.7 percent in 1990 and 6.4 percent in 1991.

The October 1992 report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Ohio's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 0.0 percent and 4.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Ohio made budget reductions of \$184.3 million after the 1992 budget was passed.
- Ohio's FY 1993 net revenues increased by \$313.4 million. This change reflected increases in sales, personal income, corporate income, tobacco, motor fuels, and other taxes as well as an increase in fees.
- The regional outlook for the Great Lakes states indicated modest economic growth. The region's weighted unemployment rate of 7.0 percent was lower than the national average of 7.8 percent; however, the region's per capita growth in personal income (2.1 percent) was weaker than the national average growth of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Responsibility for FSP operations are shared between the State and the individual counties. The Food Stamp Section, which is located within the Office of Family Support and JOBS, is responsible for State administration of FSP. There are five district offices within the State that interface with the counties. Oversight for local operations is provided by the county Department of Human Services (DHS).

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

The average monthly participation for FSP and other assistance programs is provided below in Table 2.1. Household participation in the Food Stamp Program increased by 20.2 percent between 1988 and 1992, while the number of individuals receiving FSP benefits increased by 16.5 percent. State staff were unable to provide participation data for other programs prior to 1992.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC Cases	268,599	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foster Care Children	10,573	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
General Assistance Cases	166,488	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP¹ Households	529,103	498,566	448,393	448,937	440,357
Individuals	1,244,422	1,171,305	1,078,414	1,067,975	1,067,871
Medicaid Individuals	761,624	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs improved slightly from 18.5:1 in 1988 to 19.2:1 in 1992.

Ohio's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.²

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$173.61	\$164.49	\$156.86	\$139.50	\$138.19

¹ Data provided by State staff for individuals in 1992, households in 1990, and individuals and households in 1988; the FNS *State Activity Reports* for FY 1988 through FY 1992 are the source for remaining FSP participation data.

² The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Ohio's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.³ Total FSP Federal administrative costs decreased in 1989 and increased each year between 1990 and 1992. Average cost per household followed the same pattern; it decreased in 1989 and increased in each subsequent year.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$57,289,082	\$47,459,520	\$32,138,935	\$27,378,979	\$39,446,534
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$9.02	\$7.93	\$5.85	\$5.08	\$7.46

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Areas of Food Stamp Program performance that could potentially be affected by the automated systems that support the Program include:

- Staffing
- Responsiveness to Regulatory Change
- Combined Official Payment Error Rates
- Claims Collection
- Certification/Reviews

Since CRIS-E implementation was not completed until June 30, 1992, the full potential impact of the system on program performance may not be demonstrated by the information presented in the following sections.

2.4.1 Staffing

State staff indicated that there are approximately 5,000 eligibility workers (EWs) and 500 eligibility worker supervisors throughout the State; however, more specific information was not available because each county is responsible for determining its staffing level.

³ The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

Ohio has used a generic caseworker approach for approximately seven years. In 1985 and 1986, ODHS began using a common application form (CAF). At that time, counties began training program specific workers to become generic workers.

Between January 1991 and September 1992, staffing levels did not change despite participation increases of one percent per month. The combined average caseload is between 275 and 300 cases per worker and has been increasing for the last four years. In late 1992, the State began a caseload management study to determine the maximum caseload per worker.

There are two major labor unions at the State level, but other unions may be involved at the county and local levels. Each county has its own unique set of labor problems. Changing to a generic caseworker approach required that pay level structures be revised, which required significant negotiations with State labor unions. In addition, each county had to work with its local unions to resolve problems. CRIS-E conversion and implementation were coordinated with union representatives in advance of system implementation to avoid problems.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

Of the 14 provisions shown in Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A, Ohio was able to implement seven on time. Six were implemented late and information was unavailable concerning one provision. For the six regulations that were implemented late, ODHS staff indicated that there was a lack of qualified staff to make the changes. In addition, for three of the regulations -- codes 2.2, 2.3, and 4.2 -- program staff had difficulty formulating specifications for technical staff. Two of these regulations were related to combined initial allotments under normal timeframes (code 2.2) and expedited service timeframes (code 2.3). Regulation 4.2 involved limitations on the number of replacement issuances.

State staff indicated that the required implementation dates sometimes occurred before the State received the official implementing regulations from the Federal agencies. In these cases, the State hesitated to implement system changes until final regulations had been received.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Ohio's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, increased each year between 1988 and 1992, with the exception of 1990. Overall, the error rate increased by approximately 22 percent during the five year period.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	13.19	12.54	11.18	11.33	10.78

Error rates increased during CRIS-E conversion and implementation (beginning in early 1989 and ending June 30, 1992). State staff expected increased error rates to continue for 12 to 18 months after conversion was complete (until July 1993 to December 1993). County error rates vary greatly. In counties that were converted earlier, such as Franklin County, the error rate, which was between 15 and 16 percent in FYs 1990 and 1991, should decrease in FY 1992 and FY 1993. Statewide, the dollar losses associated with the 1990 and 1991 payment error rates were between \$78.8 million and \$101.3 million.

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data, including the dollar value of claims established, the dollar value of claims collected, and the percentage of claims established that were collected. The dollar value of claims collected increased each year between 1988 and 1991 and decreased in 1992. The value of claims established increased each year except 1990. The unusually high number of claims established in 1989 was attributed to unreported claims from previous years.

Ohio's claims collected as a percentage of claims established decreased during the period. The percentage of claims collected increased each year between 1988 and 1991, except 1989, and it then decreased in 1992. The percentage of claims collected is affected by the total number of claims established, whether the individual is still receiving benefits, the amount of available assets, and other factors.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$8,108,099	\$7,003,913	\$6,947,752	\$19,111,278	\$6,564,132
Total Claims Collected	\$2,787,655	\$2,990,647	\$2,908,761	\$2,717,243	\$2,598,873
As a % of Total Claims Established	34.4%	42.7%	41.9%	14.2%	39.6%

Examination of claims data shows a trend, between 1990 and 1992, towards decreases in intentional program violations and increases in both inadvertent household errors and agency errors. Of the claims established, approximately 35 percent are caused by inadvertent household error and 45 to 50 percent are due to intentional program violation and fraud. The remainder were attributed to agency caused errors. A greater percentage of recoveries were made in claims caused by intentional program violations. State staff anticipates that CRIS-E interfaces and computer matching (once fully operational) will reduce claims associated with intentional program violations and inadvertent household errors. CRIS-E interactive interviewing and edits also are expected to result in a decrease in claims associated with agency caused errors.

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

CRIS-E implementation was completed on June 30, 1992. In September 1992, CRIS-E was reviewed by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The system received conditional Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification. As of September 1992, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) had not conducted its post-implementation review; however, State staff indicated that there were tentative plans for the FNS Midwest Regional Office to conduct this review within the next few months.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of the functionality, complexity, and level of integration of Ohio's CRIS-E and discusses some of the current automation issues in the State. CRIS-E is a statewide, interactive, on-line, integrated public assistance system that consists of over 20 separate subsystems. Since Ohio's assistance programs are county-operated, CRIS-E was designed to

respond to individual county office requirements, with respect to organization of work and reporting.

3.1 System Functionality

A case in CRIS-E is based on a standard filing unit (SFU) for all household members; the SFU represents a single case that is handled by one caseworker. Within the SFU, there may be multiple assistance groups comprised of different individuals. Ohio uses a CASE/CAT/SEQ/Claim code (case number, category of assistance, and sequence of individual in the household) to create unique, randomly selected case numbers.

Major features of CRIS-E functionality are described in this section. Areas addressed include:

- **Registration.** The client completes a two-page CAF for all assistance programs. Through CRIS-E, the screener or registration worker determines whether expedited services are required. The registration worker also performs statewide clearance to determine whether the individual is currently participating or previously has participated in any assistance programs in Ohio. The system performs searches

- **Benefit Issuance.** The State issues food stamp benefits to clients through the direct access and direct mail issuance methods. For direct access issuance, clients visit an issuance site on or after a designated date each month. The client presents an identification card containing his or her case number. An issuance worker accesses CRIS-E to issue benefits and provides food coupons to the client. In some counties, issuance sites are operated by county staff, but other counties use contractors for issuing FSP benefits. Direct mail issuance also is used in 42 counties. Coupons are mailed directly from the counties. Some counties also use contractors to support mail issuance.

In addition, there is an off-line Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) demonstration being conducted in Montgomery County. In February 1992, households in the Dayton area began participating in the EBT demonstration, in which a smart card containing a computer chip was used at the point of sale (POS) at selected retailer locations to deliver FSP benefits. Demonstration participants included approximately 11,000 households and nearly 100 retailers. Pending Federal approval to conduct a larger scale off-line EBT project, the State plans to implement a statewide EBT system.

Under Ohio law, expedited benefits must be made available to the client within 24 hours of certification. Ohio generally is able to meet this requirement. For mail issuance, the requirement is satisfied if coupons are mailed within 24 hours.

- **Notices.** System generated notices are printed and mailed from a central site. Notices generally are sent automatically, but at the discretion of the eligibility worker, exceptions can be made. The worker also can add information to specific notices regarding changes or the need for further information and review the contents of all notices sent to clients through the system.

The worker has the capability of creating a manual notice (using print screens from the system) and mailing it from the county office. Manual notices cannot be saved or stored on the system.

- **Claims System.** The Benefit Recovery subsystem is designed to initiate, track, and pursue the collection of claims associated with overpayments. Upon determining that an overpayment was made, workers complete the benefit recovery referral screen to initiate the claim process. A benefit recovery coordinator, located in the central office, is alerted to the presence of a new referral by a screen alert. The claim then is assigned to a benefit recovery worker for investigation.

The system automatically calculates the total amount of the overpayment and includes this information in the system generated demand notice that is sent to the client if the case is still active. Subsequent demand notices can be sent at the request of the recovery worker.

If recoument is the selected repayment method, the system automatically deducts payments from the benefits issued. Recoupments and payments are recorded in the system, which tracks the amount paid and outstanding. A notice is sent as a monthly statement of the claim account.

- **Computer Matching.** Computer matching is performed against several data sources. Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) matching is performed after registration and eligibility determination is completed because CRIS-E cannot perform IEVS matching before certification and still be able to complete eligibility determination within 30 days. IEVS matching is done in batch mode. If an alert results from IEVS matching, the worker must investigate further.

Data exchange matching requires case information to be sent out; after matching is performed, tapes containing matching results are returned to CRIS-E. Matching information then is available on-line in CRIS-E. Data sources matched against include: unemployment compensation, lottery, Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), Social Security Administration (SSA) wage and benefit information, State Data Exchange (SDX), and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) yearly and monthly data.

Name and SSN matching also are performed against State Wage Collection Agency (SWCA) data. Historical information always is available; however, only selected information is reported to workers. SWCA matches are reported through alerts.

- **Alerts.** CRIS-E provides on-line alerts for workers in many situations. Alerts are provided in the form of an action list, and the system can sort alerts by priority. The caseworker is able to clear alerts; however, if the activity is not performed, the alert will reappear.
- **Monthly Reporting.** As of September 1992, there is no monthly reporting in Ohio.
- **Report Generation.** CRIS-E has the capability to generate many types of batch reports for eligibility workers, supervisors, and State office staff. Most reports available in the system are regular monthly reports. Areas in which CRIS-E provides reports include: case summaries, lists of actions taken, case status updates, workload analysis, and various statistical reports.
- **Program Management and Administration.** CRIS-E provides several features to assist workers and supervisors. The system provides a mail message capability that is available to workers and enables them to send messages to other workers or set future reminders for themselves. In addition, caseload management features in the system allow supervisors to assign cases to workers, shift case assignments between workers, and delete cases from individual caseloads.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

CRIS-E provides integrated support for the following programs: FSP, AFDC, General Assistance, and Medicaid; CRIS-E also interfaces with outside systems. CRIS-E interfaces with separate systems that support other program areas, e.g., Child Welfare, as well as systems used to support computer matching.

CRIS-E is a relatively complex system. It supports interactive interviewing and on-line eligibility determination and benefit calculation.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

There are more than 10,500 CRIS-E terminals throughout the State. Since CRIS-E is designed to support interactive interviewing, eligibility workers have dedicated terminals. Additional terminals are available for use by registration workers, clerks, aides, EW supervisors, issuance workers, workers in other departments who access CRIS-E for information, district office staff, and State office staff.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

State staff indicated that there are a couple of areas in which improvements are needed. There is a need for ongoing worker training related to both program policy and CRIS-E procedures. In addition, State staff indicated that improvements are needed in administrative policies and the chain of command for problem resolution.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section discusses the approaches used in Ohio to develop and implement CRIS-E. An overview of major events, participants, and problems encountered during development and implementation is provided.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

Before CRIS-E, the Client Registry Information System (CRIS) supported the AFDC and Medicaid Programs, but there was not a statewide system for the Food Stamp Program. Each county had a separate system to support FSP operations. While a few of the county systems were highly automated, others were completely manual. In most counties, the systems did not provide adequate automation to meet workers' needs.

4.2 Justification for the New System

The existence of separate systems to support the FSP in each of the State's 88 counties resulted in several problems. As mentioned previously, most of the systems were not highly automated. In addition, there was not a central State database for FSP participants.

This resulted in the inability to meet many FSP requirements. Shortcomings of the existing systems included:

- The ability to check for duplicate participation at the time of registration did not exist.
- Mass changes were implemented manually.
- Benefit levels were calculated manually.
- Separate application forms were completed by clients for AFDC and FSP benefits.
- FSP policy was applied inconsistently throughout the State.
- Monthly reports were produced manually and used to support retrospective budgeting.
- Different procedures were used for issuing, controlling, and reconciling FSP benefits in the 88 counties.
- There was not any statewide computer matching.

The justification used by ODHS to solicit State funding from the legislature included:

- ***Improved Automation of all counties in the State.***
- ***Increased worker productivity.*** Separate systems supported the AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamp Programs. State staff estimated that improved caseload management would save as much as \$44 million for the AFDC and Food Stamp Programs.
- ***Improved Ability to Respond to Federal Requirements.*** Ohio was the last state in the nation to implement monthly reporting, and the State was deficient in implementing IEVS. State staff estimated that \$24 million would be saved by implementing changes in a timely manner through CRIS-E and that \$6 million would be saved by automatically implementing mass changes.
- ***Error Reduction.*** The existing systems were very error prone and workers were unable to keep up with changes in policies, resulting in more errors. Ohio estimated that nearly \$70 million a year would be saved by reducing errors. A two percent reduction in FSP benefits issued was expected due to statewide clearance alone. A 4.6 percent reduction in FSP error rates also was expected, resulting in a reduction of \$31.2 million in annual food stamp issuance costs.
- ***Improved Client Service.*** Automation would free the caseworker from paperwork and provide more time for client service and contact, and policies would be

applied uniformly. Ohio estimated that \$44 million would be saved through uniform policy application.

In total, Ohio estimated annual savings of \$304 million following CRIS-E implementation. After the pilot test, State staff reported that the following benefits had been achieved:

- Uniform application of program policy.
- Reduction of paperwork.
- Improved ability to shift resources.
- Improved ability for supervisors to monitor workers.
- Improved worker control over caseload management and assignment.
- Improved organizational support for the worker.
- Improved client service through the provision of immediate benefits.
- More time for client contact and service.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

CRIS-E development was initiated by public assistance program staff in the early 1980s. In the summer of 1982, a user group representing AFDC, Medicaid, FSP, financial, and data processing staff was formed to develop ideas and identify needs for an integrated system. ODHS requested funding from the State Legislature in 1982. The first request for proposals (RFP) for contractor assistance was prepared in late 1983, but there were no vendor responses because the RFP specifications, e.g., that the system be developed and implemented within one year, were considered unreasonable.

ODHS received Federal approval for the CRIS-E Advanced Planning Document (APD) in 1984. At that time, a formal CRIS-E project team was formed. ODHS contracted with Deloitte Touche to assist with system requirements and development. Between 1984 and early 1986, development activities conducted included a requirements analysis, transfer feasibility study, general system design, and conceptual database design. In early 1986, a new APD and RFP were prepared and approved. Under a second contract, Deloitte Touche began the detailed system design in May 1986. In 1988, user acceptance testing was conducted and, in May 1989, the CRIS-E pilot test was initiated in Franklin County. The pilot continued until December 1989.

In 1990, statewide implementation began. In January 1990, CRIS-E was expanded to a smaller, rural county. Rollout began in June 1990. In September 1991, when the State was only 28 percent converted and the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) interface had been completed, FNS conducted a technical review by entering test cases into the system. About the same time, responsibility for CRIS-E management was transferred from the program area to MIS. Under a third contract, Deloitte Touche continued to provide system maintenance.

CRIS-E development was divided into four functional areas:

- Application registration/automatic eligibility, authorization, eligibility determination and the Standard Filing Unit
- Reporting history maintenance and quality control
- Benefit issuance
- Client notices, scheduling, and inquiry

Each development area had two co-managers -- one of whom had technical expertise and one who represented users. All specifications had to be approved by both co-managers.

After the programming and unit testing phase, the four development areas were replaced by three new areas: systems, pilot testing, and programming.

4.4. Conversion Approach

Conversion and CRIS-E training began in 1989, and between 6,000 and 7,000 people were trained between 1989 and 1992. The conversion approach involved converting all open cases in CRIS and the county FSP systems. Conversion was almost completely manual. Training lasted one week for eligibility workers and two weeks for supervisors. The focus of the training effort was on case conversion. State trainers were assisted by county staff, referred to as "roll forward" staff, who had received more extensive CRIS-E training.

Some counties that were relatively satisfied with their existing systems were hesitant about converting to CRIS-E. State staff indicated that this attitude existed because county staff believed that they would lose some functionality of their current systems with the implementation of CRIS-E.

4.5 Project Management

State program staff, with no former experience in managing large-scale system development efforts, managed the CRIS-E project during the design and development phases. The initial CRIS-E project team was led by a project manager from the Public Assistance Bureau. The CRIS-E project director and project manager relied primarily on contractor assistance for project management and technical direction. ODHS personnel primarily provided financial and administrative oversight of the project. In 1991, responsibility for the CRIS-E project was shifted from the program area to MIS. Some State personnel felt that the CRIS-E project would have benefitted from the inclusion of State personnel with technical and project management experience earlier in the project.

There were several changes in State and contractor project management personnel during the development effort. The initial CRIS-E project director was replaced in August 1990,

and the second project director was replaced in October 1991. In 1991, the CRIS-E project manager also was replaced. Between 1986 and 1991, there were three different contractor project managers.

4.6 FSP Participation

The CRIS-E project team provided for FSP representation in the development effort. Both State program staff and county EWs participated. The Food Stamp Program Director and staff worked on the general system design and detailed system design. Program staff also participated in the development of test cases.

In general, the project team worked with Franklin County eligibility workers and EW supervisors to obtain user input for CRIS-E; however, as CRIS-E design, development, and implementation timeframes were extended, user representatives changed. By 1986, two years after the project started, the user representatives who had participated in the original design phase had been replaced. In 1989, the users changed again, leading to more system changes. The lack of user continuity over the duration of the project led to changes in user requirements. These changes also may have contributed to delays in system implementation.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS was involved in the initial requirements analysis and the general system design; however, State staff indicated that staffing levels and other responsibilities precluded MIS from taking an active role in CRIS-E development. In 1983, total MIS staff consisted of less than 30 people who were responsible for managing the Client Registry Information System (CRIS, CRIS-E's predecessor), Medicaid operations, and other systems. There had been no new development efforts for five years. When the pilot began in May 1989, MIS began to attend CRIS-E meetings and increased staff to support CRIS-E operations. By the end of 1992, total MIS staff had been increased to nearly 300 people, and a former contractor employee, who was knowledgeable about the development and maintenance requirements of CRIS-E, was put in charge of the MIS Systems Development Bureau.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

ODHS experienced a number of problems during development and implementation. Some of the more significant problems included:

- ***Incomplete System Testing.*** ODHS staff indicated that more time should have been spent on system testing. At the time of the pilot in 1989, the batch modules were not as well developed and tested as the on-line modules. ODHS began to implement the system in January 1990, before all of the problems had been identified and corrected.
- ***Training and Conversion Problems.*** In retrospect, ODHS staff believed that five days of training for EWs was inadequate and insufficient training slowed the

conversion process. Workers were expected to consolidate households, recipients, and types of assistance received information into one case file prior to attending training, so they could work on these cases during training. Many workers, however, did not prepare their files prior to attending the training sessions, which negatively impacted training.

There also were funding issues associated with conversion. DHHS provided enhanced funding (90 percent) for the first 90 days of conversion within each county, and then funding was reduced to the 50 percent Federal financial participation (FFP) level. A few counties, however, were unable to convert their cases to CRIS-E within three months. Franklin County, which had eight percent of the State's cases, required three years for conversion. It took Cuyahoga County one year to convert its caseload, which represented 20 to 25 percent of the State's total caseload. ODHS originally requested enhanced 75 percent funding from FNS to cover all implementation, training, and case conversion in a county for a six month period. FNS approval, based on the expected difficulties, permitted an enhanced funding "grace period" of eight months for Franklin County, six months for Cuyahoga County, and three months for all other counties.

- ***Lack of MMIS Interface and Lack of CRIS Maintenance.*** CRIS-E was designed to determine Medicaid eligibility and provide this information to the Medicaid Management Information System, a separate system that pays Medicaid providers for medical services. When case conversion began in January 1990, the MMIS interface was not completed. Without a working interface between CRIS-E and MMIS, the old system, CRIS, was operated parallel to CRIS-E to enable the MMIS system to make payments to Medicaid providers. Problems with the MMIS interface during the conversion period resulted in the disruption of many provider payments. Some counties refused to convert more cases until the MMIS interface problem was resolved. The problem was intensified because MIS resources were not being used to maintain the old system, CRIS. As a result, some cases were very difficult to track during the conversion process.
- ***Slow System Response Times.*** Throughout the CRIS-E implementation period, county workers repeatedly encountered slow system response times. Unexpected increases in caseloads and transaction volumes may have contributed to the slow response times.
- ***Public Assistance Program Complexity.*** In terms of system downtime, the project team found that the complexity and size of the ED/BC subsystem caused problems every time a mass change or some other change had to be implemented. Differences between FNS and DHHS requirements for eligibility or income calculations added to the complexity and size of this subsystem. Any time a change was made in the ED/BC Subsystem, there were risks of problems or disruption in the system's availability to the worker.

- **Federal Agency Coordination and Assistance.** The State indicated that some delays were encountered in obtaining approvals from all of the Federal agencies involved -- FNS, DHHS' Agency for Children and Families (ACF), and DHHS' Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA).

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

In 1985, ODHS conducted a feasibility study to determine whether any existing systems were suitable for transfer to Ohio. Based on functional and technical criteria developed by programmatic and technical representatives, Ohio identified 10 states that were potential transfer candidates. These were: Alaska, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

Telephone interviews were conducted and systems that did not meet Ohio's criteria or which were duplicative of other systems were eliminated. Site visits were conducted to see systems in the following states: Illinois, Vermont, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts. Upon reviewing these systems, Ohio decided to develop a system internally because no existing system could support Ohio's large caseload.

CRIS-E or components of the system have been transferred to several other states. Before CRIS-E received FAMIS certification, it was transferred to Florida by EDS and Deloitte Touche. Florida added some programs and changed some of CRIS-E's functionality to meet Florida's requirements. CRIS-E also was transferred to Tennessee and Indiana. Components of the CRIS-E ED/BC subsystem were transferred to Michigan.

CRIS-E is considered to be a feasible transfer candidate because it offers interactive on-line interviewing for states with very high caseloads.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the Client Registry Information System - Enhanced. The description includes a profile of system components and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting CRIS-E are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** IBM ES 9000/900
IBM ES 9000/720
MVS/ESA, COBOL II, IMS
- **Disk:** Storage Tek 3380
IBM 3390

- **Tape:** Storage Tek 3420 reel tapes
Storage Tek 3480 cartridge tapes
Storage Tek robotic silos
- **Printers:** IBM 4245 Impact
IBM 3800 Laser
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** Memorex/Telex 3270
- **Telecommunications Network:** Statewide microwave network

A detailed listing is provided as Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section describes the operating environment in Ohio. Areas addressed include: operations and maintenance, telecommunications, system performance, system response, and system downtime. Current activities in the systems area and future plans also are addressed.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

CRIS-E is run on a two processor mainframe configuration at the State data center. The State data center provides processing support for other State agencies and other ODHS applications. The State data center operates 24 hours per day. The on-line processing window is between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and the batch processing period begins at 7:00 p.m. and ends at 7:00 a.m. daily.

As detailed in Exhibit A-6.1, two IBM ES 9000 systems, a model 900 and a model 720, and associated peripherals operate at the State data center. As of September 1992, 117 disk devices were dedicated to storing public assistance data. Since the disk devices were being utilized at 90 percent of capacity, the State had initiated the process for acquiring an additional 32 devices to reduce the disk allocation to 70 percent. This action was needed to help improve channel and disk controller performance by reducing contention. The 160,000 volume tape library, which includes 80,000 to 90,000 CRIS-E volumes, is supported by Storage Tek tape library silos and 3480-type cartridge tape drives. A small number of 3420-type reel tape drives also are maintained for external tape input and output requirements.

Application and system software supporting CRIS-E include standard and customized software. The mainframe runs under IBM's MVS/ESA operating system, and CRIS-E runs under IMS. TELON, an application program code generator, was used by contractor

personnel to develop CRIS-E and continues to be used by both contractor support staff and State personnel to maintain and enhance the application programs. Deloitte Touche customized an earlier TELON release that was then used to generate the majority of the CRIS-E code. Since it was customized, new releases of TELON must be used separately

have touch tone capabilities. The State contracted with the telephone companies to rewire County DHS offices for CRIS-E.

6.2.4 System Performance

State staff estimated that the average prime shift utilization for the IBM 9000/900 is about 70 percent. There are short peak periods, however, at which the processor utilization reaches 90 percent. CRIS-E uses about 50 percent of the IBM 9000/900's processing capacity.

The daily volume on CRIS-E is approximately 1.43 million transactions per day. Continued transaction growth can be absorbed in the present configuration. In addition, other systems that share the 900 processor can be moved to other processors, thereby allowing the ES 9000/900 unit to support CRIS-E for an extended period.

6.2.5 System Response

State staff reported that system response times were in the two to five second range with longer response times for complicated transactions, such as eligibility determination and benefit calculation. Program staff reported that users basically are satisfied with system response.

6.2.6 System Downtime

State staff reported that since the middle of 1992, system downtime has not been a problem.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

During conversion, CRIS-E system changes and enhancements had to be suspended; this resulted in a large backlog of required changes. MIS and contractor staff responsible for system maintenance are working to reduce this backlog and perform activities needed to obtain full FAMIS certification.

ODHS also would like to simplify the eligibility determination/benefit calculation subsystem. The subsystem, which contains nearly 900 programs and the complex logic necessary to address the multiple (and often conflicting) requirements of the multiple assistance programs, is difficult to modify and test. ODHS MIS staff believe that this program should be modified to simply on-going maintenance of the module.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses CRIS-E system development costs and approved Federal funding, on-going food stamp system operating costs, and cost allocation methodologies applied to allocating development and operating costs.

7.1 CRIS-E Development Costs and Federal Funding

Federal approval of a CRIS-E APD by both DHHS and FNS first occurred in January 1984. System development costs of approximately \$32 million were approved, with the understanding that funding approvals would be required for each phase of the project. An APD Update (APDU) was submitted in August 1985 and, in 1986, ODHS submitted APD Amendment 1, which detailed the planned approach and costs for project implementation (Phase III). This amendment resulted in a significant increase in the level of funding requested for CRIS-E. The FSP share of this increase totaled \$6,872,371. At 75 percent FFP, the FNS share was \$5,145,278.

Additional APDUs and APD amendments were submitted during the development, implementation, and conversion periods. The November 1990 APDU projected total funding requirements at \$54,934,747. As of March 1991, total costs were projected to be approximately \$56.8 million. The total share of CRIS-E development costs allocated to FSP through June 1991 was \$19,047,739. The approved FNS share, based on funding at a combination of 50 percent FFP and 75 percent FFP, was \$13,553,758. In June 1992, an additional \$5.4 million was requested to complete case conversion to CRIS-E, resulting in total funding requests of \$62.2 million.

Actual costs for CRIS-E through March 1992 were reported to be \$69,715,000. This amount, however, included some operational costs as well as development costs. The amount allocated to the Food Stamp Program was \$20,935,000.

7.1.1 CRIS-E System Components

CRIS-E supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and General Assistance Programs.

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

A complete breakdown of actual CRIS-E development costs by cost component was not available; however, some information was available about budgeted costs. Table 7.1 provides the estimated CRIS-E development costs by component as presented in the March 1987 APD.

Table 7.1 Estimated CRIS-E Development Costs by Component

Cost Component	Estimated Cost
Deloitte Touche Contract	\$11,534,680
State Personnel	\$3,587,000
Technical Advisor	\$310,052
Building Rental	\$175,000
Travel	\$105,000
Training	\$1,100,000
Site Preparation	\$79,080
Conversion	\$2,717,800
Hardware	\$24,689,465
ODN Processing	\$9,630,570
Total	\$53,928,647

7.1.2.1 Contractor Costs

Data also were available about the ODHS contract with the development contractor, Deloitte Touche. The original contract covered the period from January 1, 1985 to November 30, 1989, and totalled \$11,534,680. The contract scope included system test and pilot operations, but it did not cover all aspects of the transition to State operations. An amended contract with Deloitte Touche ran from December 1989 through December 1990, and provided additional funding for items such as Health Start, Food Stamp reporting, Family Support Act (FSA) of 1988, Title IV-A/IV-D interface, Project Learn, court ordered mandates, client notice changes, spousal impoverishment, system support, transition, and project management. The amended contract added \$3,883,005 in contractor costs. The contract was amended several times to provide funding for the transition of the system to State employees. A total of \$3.5 million was added through these amendments. Total contractor costs through June 30, 1992 were \$18,917,685.

In March 1992, plans to add 10 additional contractor staff through June 30, 1992 were approved. This did not increase CRIS-E costs because funds budgeted for State personnel were shifted to purchased services.

A contract option, to extend the Deloitte Touche contract for a year (through June 30, 1993), also was exercised. This resulted in additional contractor costs of \$1,990,000. The shift of \$511,000 from State personnel to contractor costs and the one year extension of contractor support increased the cost for contractor services to a total of \$21,418,685.

7.2 Ohio Operational Costs

Table 7.2, Food Stamp Program Operating Costs, shows the operational charges submitted to FNS in the "ADP Oper Costs" column of the SF-269 for FY 1990 through FY 1992. The significant variations in operational costs each year reflects the inclusion of CRIS-E operational costs as the system was implemented throughout the State.

Table 7.2 Food Stamp Program Operating Costs

FFY	SF-269 ADP Operational Costs	FNS Share at 50% FFP
1990	\$260,084	\$130,042
1991	\$3,029,515	\$1,514,757
1992	\$7,973,949	\$3,986,975

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

The monthly cost per case for FY 1992 was \$1.26. This cost was calculated based on the average monthly operational costs for FSP in FY 1992, \$664,496, and the 1992 average monthly food stamp caseload of 529,103 households.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

Ohio has assigned the responsibility for managing and overseeing cost allocation to the ODHS Cost Allocation/Random Moment Study (RMS) unit.

Hardware costs are borne by ODN and billed back to ODHS based on CRIS-E utilization during the month. There is no vehicle in place to evaluate or justify added hardware specifically for CRIS-E. As utilization grows, ODN acquires the necessary equipment and its costs are recovered through an increase in the resource charges in the monthly utilization bill.

7.3 Ohio Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section describes the cost allocation methodologies used to allocate system development and on-going operational costs to the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

The cost allocation plan in the 1984 APD allocated direct charges based on the number of recipients. This involved determining the unduplicated caseload in each program area. Then, recipient subtotals by program were compared to the total unduplicated number of recipients to derive percentage weighting factors for each program. The following

allocation percentages were determined for costs to be allocated among the four supported program areas:

- AFDC - 43.80 percent
- FSP - 38.78 percent
- Medicaid - 9.05 percent
- General Assistance - 8.37 percent

The following weighting factors were applied to costs that were to be allocated to three programs:

- AFDC - 47.80 percent
- FSP - 42.32 percent
- Medicaid - 9.88 percent

Costs applicable only to the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs were allocated based on the following percentages:

- AFDC - 53.04 percent
- FSP - 43.96 percent

Allocation percentages were revised periodically to reflect changes in recipient counts by program.

7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

ODHS currently uses 89 cost pools and three methods to allocate accumulated costs: direct charges, direct allocated, and indirect allocated. For direct allocated costs, the formula used is the total recipient count by program divided by the total recipient count for all programs.

There are two types of indirect costs and two methods for allocating these costs.

- ***County indirect costs.*** The percentage of those charges accumulated by the ODHS is determined by the Random Moment Study technique in all county offices. RMS is performed quarterly in all counties.
- ***Non-county indirect costs.*** These are apportioned by using the number of direct and indirect employees as listed on the State's payroll system.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF OHIO

EXHIBITS

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to DHHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	N	Y	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	N	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	N	--	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	--	--	--
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	Y	Y	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	--	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	N	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

**Exhibit A-6.1
State of Ohio Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
ES 9000/900	IBM	Purchase	235 MIPS (1)
ES 9000/720	IBM	Purchase	114 MIPS (1)
DISK			
3390/3380	IBM/Storage Tek	Purchase	400 gigabytes
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives	Storage Tek	Purchase	3420 (12)
Cartridge Drives	Storage Tek	Purchase	3480 (64)
	Storage Tek	Purchase	silos (4)
PRINTERS			
Impact	IBM	Purchase	4245 (2)
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3800 (4)
FRONT ENDS			
FEP	IBM	Purchase	3745 (2)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	Memorex/ Telex	Purchase	3270 terminals (10,535)

APPENDIX B

STATE OF OHIO

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Ohio. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Ohio. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Ohio	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
5,000	63	1.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	36	57.1%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Ohio. The number of responses, however, is low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are satisfied with the computer system in Ohio. EWs generally find the system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use to be acceptable. Responses also indicate some perceived problems with the system. A majority of workers feel that the system sometimes calculates benefits incorrectly and makes certain functions difficult to perform. Nevertheless, more than 80 percent of EWs feel that the system is a great help to them overall.

Compared to the previous system, over 95 percent of eligibility workers prefer the current system. Most of the respondents believe the system makes them more efficient and productive. Compared to the previous system, EWs generally think that the current system has a positive impact or little effect in two areas: client service and fraud and errors.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	5.6
Good	27	75.0
Excellent	7	19.4

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	8	22.2
Good	28	77.8

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	3	8.3
Sometimes	33	91.7

Respondents generally are satisfied with system response time. More than 94 percent of the eligibility workers think that overall system response time is excellent or good, and nearly 78 percent believe that response time is good during peak processing periods.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	1	2.8
Often	35	97.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	30.6
Sometimes	22	61.1
Often	3	8.3

More than 97 percent of the EWs think that the system is available when they need to use it, but nearly 70 percent also report that the system is sometimes or often down. Apparently the system downtime is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	2.8
Good	30	83.3
Excellent	5	13.9

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	75.0
Sometimes	7	19.4
Often	2	5.6

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	44.4
Sometimes	20	55.6

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	61.1
Sometimes	13	36.1
Often	1	2.8

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	9.1
About the same	5	22.7
Easier	15	68.2

The eligibility workers generally think the system's data and computations are quite accurate and timely. Nearly 97 percent feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or

excellent; however, a majority believes that eligibility sometimes is determined incorrectly. Compared to the previous system, more than 68 percent of eligibility workers think that the new system makes accurate benefit calculation easier.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	72.2
Sometimes	8	22.2
Often	2	5.6

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	66.7
Sometimes	11	30.6
Often	1	2.8

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	8	25.0

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	61.1
Sometimes	11	30.6
Often	3	8.3

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	62.5
Sometimes	11	34.4
Often	1	3.1

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	72.2
Sometimes	10	27.8

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	82.9
Sometimes	6	17.1

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	75.0
Sometimes	8	22.2
Often	1	2.8

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	80.6
Sometimes	7	19.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	77.8
Sometimes	6	16.7
Often	2	5.6

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	63.3
Sometimes	9	30.0
Often	2	6.7

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	54.3
Sometimes	14	40.0
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	71.4
Sometimes	9	25.7
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	66.7
Sometimes	10	27.8
Often	2	5.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	60.0
Sometimes	12	34.3
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	38.7
Sometimes	13	41.9
Often	6	19.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
--	-----------------------	-------------------------------

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	5	22.7
Easier	17	77.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	5.0
About the same	3	15.0
Easier	16	80.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	10.5
Easier	17	89.5

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	4.5
About the same	3	13.6
Easier	18	81.8

Most eligibility workers feel that the system is easy to use for many of the functions discussed. With the exception of identifying

error prone and suspected fraud cases, the majority of EWs reports rarely having difficulty performing each of the functions. Large minorities, however, perceive some difficulty in generating warning and adverse action notices, monitoring hearing status, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying cases making payments through recoupment.

In comparison to the previous system, most workers feel that the new system is easy to use. For each specific function, between 77 and 90 percent of the EWs feel that it is easier to perform the task with the current system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	7	19.4
Often	29	80.6

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	36.1
Sometimes	20	55.6
Often	3	8.3

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	61.1
Sometimes	12	33.3
Often	2	5.6

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	10	43.5
More	13	56.5

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	1	4.5
About the same	10	45.5
More	11	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	6	27.3
About the same	10	45.5
More	6	27.3

Under the new (current) system, how much are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	5	22.7
More	17	77.3

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	8	36.4
More	14	63.6

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	4.5
Better	21	95.5

The eligibility workers are generally satisfied with the system, although a majority sometimes feels that the system adds stress to the job. More than 80 percent of EWs feel that the system often is a great help to them.

Compared to the previous system, over 95 percent of EWs prefer the current system. EWs also believe that the new system has enabled them to be more efficient and productive in their work.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	77.1
Sometimes	7	20.0
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	77.1
Sometimes	6	17.1
Often	2	5.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	4	18.2
About the same	6	27.3
Easier	12	54.5

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the number of trips the client has to make to obtain benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	16	72.7
Fewer	6	27.3

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of time a client has to wait in the office?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	2	9.1
About the same	9	40.9
Less	11	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of paperwork demanded of the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	2	9.1
About the same	11	50.0
Less	9	40.9

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or no effect on client service. Most workers feel that expedited service is relatively easy to achieve. The vast majority also believes that in comparison to the previous system, the degree of difficulty associated with interviewing clients in a timely manner, the amount of client time spent waiting in the office, and the amount of paperwork required from clients are the same or less under the current system.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	12.5
About the same	10	62.5
Easier	4	25.0

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	3	13.6
About the same	3	13.6
Fewer	16	72.7

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	7	31.8
Fewer	15	68.2

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or little effect on fraud and errors. The majority thinks that the number of undetected fraud cases and the number of errors made are lower than with the previous system. Most workers believe, however, that the level of difficulty associated with collecting overpayments is about the same with the current and previous systems.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF OHIO

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Ohio. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EW Supervisors in Ohio	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
500	30	6.0%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	14	46.7%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Ohio. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

Most of the EW supervisors believe that the system sometimes or often helps them in their jobs. The majority of EW supervisors reports that response time, system availability, and accuracy are acceptable. EW supervisors also feel that the system generally is easy to use. Supervisors agree that the system generally contributes to improved job satisfaction and supports most management needs.

In comparison to the previous system, all of the responding EW supervisors prefer the current system. In general, EW supervisors think that the current system is easier to use and offers improvements in many areas including job satisfaction, management support, and client service.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	11	78.6
Excellent	3	21.4

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	23.1
Good	8	61.5
Excellent	2	15.4

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	28.6
Sometimes	10	71.4

EW supervisors in Ohio are satisfied with system response time. All of the respondents think that overall response time is good or excellent. During peak processing periods, nearly 77 percent feel that response time is good or excellent.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	14	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	57.1
Sometimes	6	42.9

EW supervisors think that system availability generally is good. All of the respondents believe that the system often is available when needed. Although 43 percent think that the system is sometimes down, this downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	7	50.0
Excellent	7	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.1
Easier	13	92.9

EW supervisors perceive the quality of the system's data and the accuracy of its calculations to be very good. All of the supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent. In comparison to the previous system, approximately 93 percent of the EW supervisors think that it is easier to calculate benefit levels accurately with the current system.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	78.6
Sometimes	3	21.4

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	71.4
Sometimes	4	28.6

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	91.7
Sometimes	1	8.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	92.9
Sometimes	1	7.1

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	90.0
Sometimes	1	10.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	83.3
Sometimes	2	16.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	5	35.7
Easier	9	64.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.7
Easier	12	92.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	9	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	3	21.4
Easier	11	78.6

EW supervisors generally feel that the system is easy to use. For each of the functions addressed, between 71 and 93 percent of the responding EW supervisors report rarely having difficulty with the function. For all functions, the majority of EW supervisors also

believes that in comparison with the previous system, it is easier to perform specific functions with the current system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	2	14.3
Often	12	85.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	50.0
Sometimes	7	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	7.1
About the same	11	78.6
More	2	14.3

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	12	85.7
More	2	14.3

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	4	28.6
About the same	10	71.4

Under the new (current) system, how much work are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	7.1
About the same	4	28.6
More	9	64.3

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	7.1
About the same	4	28.6
More	9	64.3

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Better	14	100.0

EW supervisors feel that the system improves job satisfaction. Nearly 86 percent of EW supervisors think the system often is a great help. Half of the supervisors also believe that it rarely is an additional source of stress.

In comparison to the previous system, EW supervisors feel that the current system is equivalent or better. All responding supervisors report that the current system is better than the previous system. While over 64 percent of EW supervisors feel that they are more productive and efficient with the current system, most supervisors report similar levels of satisfaction, pleasantness, and stress in their work with the current and previous systems.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	42.9
Good	7	50.0
Excellent	1	7.1

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	7.1
Good	10	71.4
Excellent	3	21.4

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	50.0
Sometimes	6	50.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	83.3
Sometimes	2	16.7

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are the people you supervise?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	5	35.7
More	9	64.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to make mass changes?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	14	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to evaluate local office efficiency?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	3	21.4
About the same	5	35.7
Easier	6	42.9

For the most part, EW supervisors feel that the system supports management needs. Most supervisors feel that the quality of the technical support is good or excellent. Almost 43 percent of the supervisors, however, believe that the quality of reports produced by the system is poor.

In comparison to the previous system, supervisors generally view the current system as meeting their management needs better. All supervisors feel that the current system facilitates making mass changes. In addition, more than 64 percent of the supervisors feel that the personnel they supervise are more efficient with the current system.

Client Service

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	3	21.4
About the same	6	42.9
Easier	5	35.7

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the services received by the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	14.3
Better	12	85.7

Under the new (current) system, how do you think the average client is being served?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.1
Better	13	92.9

The majority of EW supervisors believes that client service is improved with the current system. A minority (21 percent) believes that it is more difficult to interview a client in a timely manner with the current system than it was with the previous system.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	11	84.6
Easier	2	15.4

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	10	71.4
Less	4	28.6

Under the new (current) system, how many false claims are caught?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	1	7.7
About the same	6	46.2
More	6	46.2

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	1	7.1
About the same	9	64.3
Fewer	4	28.6

EW supervisors feel that compared to the previous system, the current system has a positive or neutral impact with respect to fraud and errors. Large majorities of respondents think that the ability to collect overpayments, reduce errors, and identify fraud is similar under the current and previous systems. A significant minority, however, feels that more false claims are caught with the current system.